

REMARKS

Rejections under 35 USC § 102 and 103

All claims have been rejected under § 102 and § 103 over two United States Patents, either alone or in combination. These patents are Ganderton, USPN 3,814,097 and Reid 5,312,456.

A. Rejection under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by Ganderton, USPN 3,814,097

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 7, 30, 31, 55, 57, 59-62, 65-68, 71-74, 76, 78, 80, 83-86, 89-91, 93, 94, 99-100 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ganderton et al., USPN 3,814,097.

Ganderton disclosed use of an adhesive, but explicitly cites its use "In the area surrounding the pad...". The adhesive is used "in order to prevent undue leakage of the formulation of the pharmacologically active material from the periphery of the areas of skin to which the pad is pressed..".

Both of the two independent claims 6 and 30, recite that the sheet, from which the pads extend, has one or more surfaces to which an adhesive has been applied. Both the Applicants' sheet and Ganderton's pad are the structures which support the Applicants' blades and Ganderton's fibres.

In addition, there is no mention in Ganderton of a sampling device connected to the sheet (Ganderton's pad).

Because Ganderton does not recite an adhesive attached to the pad or a sampling device connected to the pad, it does not disclose all elements of the Applicants' claims and cannot serve as an anticipatory reference. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection over Ganderton.

**B. Rejection under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated
by Reed, USPN 5,312,456**

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 55, 57, 59, 64-66, 71 and 72 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Reed et al., USPN 5,311,456

Reed does not disclose the use of an adhesive and does teach away from the use of adhesives. In fact, the primary purpose of Reed was to find a better means of locking two elements together other than an adhesive.

"While adhesives are available for use, due to their chemical nature, not all environments are conducive to their use to link microminiature components or objects. What is needed is a more versatile technique to link microminiature objects." Column 1, 26-30.

Further, the elements in Reed which are used to lock the microminiature objects together are not blades, as recited in Applicants' independent claims 6

and 30. Applicants have not specially defined the term “blade” and are using it the sense that it is commonly used, such as the blade of a knife or the blade of a fan.

The elements in Reed are all circular and many are umbrella shaped so that elements on mating pieces lock together by intertwining the umbrella portions of the elements and thus holding the two pieces together.

Because Reed does not disclose blades and teaches away from the use of adhesives, it does not teach all elements of Applicants' claims and therefore cannot serve as an anticipatory reference.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection over Reed.

**C. Rejection under 35 USC § 103 as being obvious
over Ganderton, USPN 3,814,097 and Reed, USPN 5,312,456.**

All of the claims rejected by the Examiner under § 103 are dependent from one of the two independent claims 6 or 30. Because the § 102 rejections were the only rejections of the independent claims and these rejections have been traversed by the arguments provided herein, all of the claims which depend from claims 6 or 30 are dependent from allowed claims and are therefore allowable themselves.

Applicants respectfully assert that the claims as now configured are in condition for allowance, notice of which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 30 July 2001

By: Owen J. Bates
Owen J. Bates

Registration No. 40,346

ALZA Corporation
1900 Charleston Road
(P.O. Box 7219
Palo Alto, CA 94039-7210
Telephone: (650) 564-7867 Fax: (650) 564-2195